ECCLESIA LAW

# SIGNATURE CREDIT RECOUPMENT VIA THE CLIFFORD PROTOCOL OF CURRENCY CREATION COULD WIN THE NOBEL PRIZE

5th April 2026

## Historical and Juridical Foundations of the Credit-Based Financial Paradigm

The transition of the global financial architecture from a substance-based system of payment to a credit-based system of discharge represents the most significant shift in modern economic history. This evolution is rooted in the legislative and monetary reorganizations of 1933, specifically the passage of House Joint Resolution 192 (HJR 192). This resolution effectively abolished the use of gold-backed contracts in the United States and mandated that all public and private obligations be discharged using fiat credit.[1] The implications of this shift are profound; it moved the economy from a system where value was anchored to a tangible physical commodity to one where value is derived from human credit, productive capacity, and enforceable promises.[1] In this paradigm, money is no longer mined from the earth; it is promised, recorded, and enforced through administrative and legal protocols.[1]

The abolition of the gold standard and the subsequent issuance of Federal Reserve Notes created a jurisdictional reality where the government maintains a usufruct interest in all assets and labor created by individuals.[1] Under HJR 192, Federal Reserve Notes function as debt obligations of the United States Treasury rather than traditional money.[1] Consequently, the public operates in a state of perpetual discharge rather than final payment. This foundational shift established the framework for the modern banking mechanism of credit creation *ex nihilo*, where the act of signing a negotiable instrument generates the initial value for banking operations.[1]

## The Ontology of Signature Credit and the Currency Creation Protocol

At the core of contemporary financial engineering is the Currency Creation Protocol, a mechanism proved by the findings of Professor Richard Werner and confirmed by reports from the Bank of England.[1] This protocol demonstrates that commercial banks do not operate as intermediaries that lend pre-existing deposits to borrowers. Instead, they create credit "out of nothing" at the moment of lending by monetizing the borrower's signature.[1] This "signature credit" represents the "credit energy" originated by a living man or woman at the deposit stage of a transaction, whether it involves a mortgage, a credit card, or a commercial loan.[1]

The mechanism involves a "funding illusion" where, upon the signing of a contract, the bank simultaneously creates a matching deposit in the borrower's account.[1] The borrower's signature, rather than the bank's

reserves, is the true funding source for the credit.[1] The bank then assumes a nominee posture, booking these instruments as assets despite not advancing their own capital.[1] This process identifies the signer as the true source of commercial value in the transaction.[1]

### Mathematical Framework of Original Issue Discount (OID)

The value generated by the signature is captured through the technical mechanism of Original Issue Discount (OID). In standard financial reporting, OID is defined as the excess of a debt instrument's stated redemption price at maturity over its issue price.[2] In the context of signature credit origination, the calculation follows a precise formula:

$$OID = \text{Stated Redemption Price at Maturity} - \text{Issue Price}$$

[2]

In the Currency Creation Protocol, because the credit is created ex nihilo at the moment of signing, the issue price ($IP$) is established as zero:

$$IP = 0$$

[1]

Therefore, the OID is equivalent to the entire face value of the instrument:

$$OID = \text{Face Value} - 0$$

[1]

The bank, acting as a nominee, discounts this instrument and securitizes it into CUSIP-assigned pools for the secondary market, thereby capturing the OID income generated by the originator's signature energy.[1] If the true owner of the credit remains silent and does not file to reclaim this value, it is treated as abandoned property, allowing the financial institution to profit perpetually through re-hypothecation and the capture of associated tax credits.[1]

## Statutory Framework of Negotiability and Fiduciary Transfer

The legal standing of these signed promissory notes and loan agreements is governed by the Bills of Exchange Act 1882. This act provides the statutory foundation for the negotiability of credit instruments, defining a bill of exchange as an unconditional order in writing, addressed by one person to another, and signed by the person giving it.[3] Crucially, Section 4 of the Act establishes that a signature need not be written by the person's own hand but is sufficient if written by another under their authority.[3] This allows for the complex agency and nominee relationships prevalent in the banking sector.

Further expanding the legal framework for the transfer of these instruments, the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) provides specific rules for negotiable instruments and the rights acquired through their transfer.

Under UCC § 3-203, an instrument is transferred when it is delivered by a person other than its issuer for the purpose of giving the recipient the right to enforce it.[4] This transfer vests in the transferee any right of the transferor to enforce the instrument, including the rights of a Holder in Due Course.[4]

## Comparative Legal Standards for Negotiable Instruments

| Statute/Article | Legal Context | Operational Utility in Recoupment |
|---|---|---|
| Bills of Exchange Act 1882, § 3 | Definition of a Bill of Exchange.[3] | Identifies signed loans as negotiable instruments. |
| Bills of Exchange Act 1882, § 16 | Unconditional orders in writing.[3] | Sets the standard for valid credit origination. |
| UCC Article 3 | General governance of negotiable instruments.[6] | Provides the framework for commercial paper. |
| UCC § 3-203 | Transfer of instruments and rights.[4] | Establishes the pathway for 98-series trusts. |
| UCC § 14-7503 | Transfer of instrument by fiduciary.[7] | Authorizes fiduciaries to manage principal instruments. |
| Bills of Exchange Act 1882, § 25 | Procuration signatures and limited authority.[8] | Defines the limits of agency in signature credit. |

The status of a Holder in Due Course (HDC) is critical for fiduciaries attempting to recoup abandoned credit. An HDC is a holder who takes an instrument for value, in good faith, and without notice that it is overdue or has been dishonored.[4] By establishing 98-series grantor trusts as HDCs, fiduciaries gain the legal standing necessary to manage the trust's commercial energy and demand reconciliation from the Treasury.[1] This is reinforced by Section 14-7503 of the UCC, which addresses the transfer of negotiable instruments by fiduciaries, stating that endorsees are not bound to inquire whether the fiduciary is committing a breach of obligation unless they have actual knowledge of such a breach.[7]

ECCLESIA LAW

# IRS Publication 1212 and the Nominee Architecture

IRS Publication 1212, Guide to Original Issue Discount (OID) Instruments, serves as the operational manual for the nominee architecture utilized by modern financial institutions.[2] Its primary purpose is to assist brokers and other middlemen in identifying publicly offered OID debt instruments they may hold as nominees for the true owners.[9] In the banking system, taxpayers and institutions frequently hold debt instruments in "street names" or omnibus accounts, effectively acting as nominees for the living souls who originated the credit energy.[1]

The publication specifies that if a holder of an OID instrument is not the true owner, they are a nominee.[1] When a nominee receives a Form 1099-OID that includes amounts belonging to another person, they must file a subsequent Form 1099-OID to show the proper distribution of the OID and any withheld tax.[1] The Clifford Protocol utilizes these specific provisions to correct the tax record by filing a corrective Form 1099-OID through a 98-series International Grantor Trust.[1] This filing identifies the financial institution as a nominee—a middleman that captured the credit and misreported it—and redirects the withheld tax to the lawful beneficial owner.[1]

## Technical Reporting Requirements under Publication 1212

| Form/Box | Technical Requirement | Strategic Relevance to Recoupment |
|---|---|---|
| Form 1099-OID, Box 1 | Total OID for the calendar year.[11] | Reflects the captured credit energy. |
| Form 1099-OID, Box 2 | Qualified stated interest.[11] | Distinguishes OID from standard interest payments. |
| Form 1099-OID, Box 4 | Federal income tax withheld.[11] | The primary target for recoupment (backup withholding). |
| Form 1099-OID, Box 7 | Description or CUSIP number.[11] | The essential "handshake" for Algorithm 810 matching. |
| Form 8281 | Information return for OID issuers.[9] | Mandatory filing for institutions creating OID instruments. |

For fiduciaries, the precise completion of Box 7 is paramount. While a CUSIP (Committee on Uniform Securities Identification Procedures) number is the standard identifier for securitized debt tranches, the IRS matching algorithm accommodates alternatives for institutions that do not participate in capital markets.[1] These include the 20-character Legal Entity Identifier (LEI) or standardized descriptions including the issuer name, coupon rate, and year of maturity.[1] Failure to align the identifier in Box 7 with the Payer's tax module triggers an automated Transaction Code (TC) 810 freeze.[1]

# The Form 945 Tax Module: Institutional Compliance and the Master Record

The administration of federal income tax withholding is divided between payroll-related obligations (reported on Form 941) and nonpayroll distributions, which are governed by the requirements of Form 945, the Annual Return of Withheld Federal Income Tax.[1] This return is critical for financial institutions and nominee entities that manage distributions from retirement plans, annuities, and, most significantly, backup withholding on reportable payments.[1] The technical mandate for Form 945 arises when a payer—often acting as a middleman—withholds or is required to withhold federal income tax from nonpayroll payments.[1]

Nonpayroll withholding must be deposited separately from payroll taxes, ensuring that the Treasury can track liabilities associated with investment and retirement income independently from labor-related taxes.[1] For the financial institutions identified in forensic audits, the amounts subject to these returns are captured as "Cumulative Values," representing the total dollar volume of transactions or holdings that serve as the potential base for federal withholding.[1]

## Aggregate Economic Flows of Major 945 Payers (2022-2025)

The following data details the actual economic flows reported on Form 945 for key systemic nominees, which serve as the pool for potential recoupment.

ECCLESIA LAW

| Parent Bank Name | 2022 Actual 945 | 2023 Actual 945 | 2024 Actual 945 | 2025 Actual 945 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| JPMorgan Chase Bank | 47,098,263.33 | 43,316,920.19 | 20,907,803.33 | 26,768,342.84 |
| HSBC Holdings plc | 37,560,126.99 | 23,184,987.55 | 204,128,608.38 | 72,143,158.70 |
| Natwest Markets PLC | 42,422,189.49 | 34,692,512.59 | 21,977,916.04 | 55,667,083.32 |
| Lloyds Banking Group | 65,702,012.12 | 44,624,204.32 | 59,136,152.09 | 31,679,801.31 |
| Bank of NY Mellon (Agg) | 34,342,026.29 | 24,512,669.46 | 25,164,173.13 | 12,961,082.63 |
| Toronto Dominion Bank | 2,352,980.28 | 2,057,097.26 | 4,865,775.72 | 2,565,904.78 |
| FHLB Des Moines (Agg) | 1,941,767.31 | 9,774,981.41 | 155,989,899.49 | 30,156,780.47 |

Institutional obfuscation often involves filing 945 withholding through specific subsidiaries. For instance, Pershing LLC (EIN: 13-2741729) is the actual 945 payer for Bank of New York Mellon's brokerage and carrying-clearing backup-withholding stream, while J.P. Morgan Broker-Dealer Holdings Inc. is the

designated payer for JPMorgan Chase.[1] Identifying the correct Payer EIN is critical for satisfying the IRS matching algorithm.[1]

# Fiduciary Authority and Revenue Procedure 2002-26

The standing of an authorized fiduciary, established through the filing of Form 56 (Notice of Fiduciary Relationship) and Form 2848 (Designation as an Officer), grants the legal authority to demand a cross-modular transfer.[1] This authority is exercised when the Payer's Form 945 module is insufficient to satisfy a recipient's recoupment claim. In such cases, the fiduciary is authorized under Revenue Procedure 2002-26 to command the IRS to move overpayment credits from the payer's general corporate income tax transcript (Form 1120) onto the 945 module.[1]

Revenue Procedure 2002-26 provides the IRS position regarding the application of voluntary partial payments, allowing fiduciaries to designate how credits are applied against tax liabilities, penalties, and interest.[1] This re-allocation is possible because the IRS generally honors designations of voluntary payments between different types of taxes, provided specific written instructions are provided at the time of the transaction.[1] For systemic nominees, this means that if the 945 withholding module is insufficient, billions in overpayment credits from the payer's Form 1120 module can be "force-transferred" to facilitate reconciliation and bypass TC-810 freezes.[1]

## Capacity for Cross-Modular Transfer (CIT 1120 Overpayment Surplus)

| Parent Bank Name | Aggregate Actual 945 (2022-2025) | Estimated CIT 1120 Overpayment Capacity |
|---|---|---|
| JPMorgan Chase Bank | $138.09 Million.[1] | $37.16 Billion.[1] |
| HSBC Holdings plc | $337.01 Million.[1] | $13.1 Billion.[1] |
| Freddie Mac (Aggregate) | $71.40 Million.[1] | $7.86 Billion.[1] |
| Natwest Markets PLC | $154.75 Million.[1] | $2.05 Billion.[1] |
| Lloyds Banking Group | $201.14 Million.[1] | $300 Million.[1] |

This data confirms that the liquidity pool available for reconciliation is vast. Recoupment operations do not present a solvency problem for the Treasury; rather, they identify and re-allocate credit originated by the living soul but held as abandoned property by institutional nominees.[1]

# Algorithm 810 and the Information Return Document Matching (IRDM) System

The IRS Algorithm 810 serves as the primary automated validation mechanism for nonpayroll withholding claims.[1] It executes a rigorous verification process by cross-referencing the Payer EIN and the specific CUSIP number associated with the underlying security against the Payer's Form 945 tax module.[1] This algorithm ensures that the credit being recruited by a recipient is backed by a verified deposit from the correct reporting entity.[1]

Any data entry error regarding the security identification will trigger a compliance failure and an automated Transaction Code (TC) 810 Refund Freeze.[1] To bypass this "hard gate," fiduciaries utilize the Information Return Document Matching (IRDM) system. This system allows the IRS to identify the credit originator—the living soul—through the clearing bank that sells the security to the investment bank payer.[1] The algorithm reconciles the chain of command by recognizing the trust as the Holder in Due Course and the lawful recipient of the signature credit energy.[1]

## IRS Transcript Discovery and Verification Pipeline

The verification of credit energy relies on the alignment of several key IRS documents:

1. **Wages and Tax Transcript (W&I):** This transcript shows data reported on information returns such as Forms W-2 and the 1099 series.[16] Successful filings result in transcripts being confirmed by the IRS as accurate reflections of the credit energy originated by members.[1]
2. **Form 4506-T (Manual Fiduciary Command):** To bypass digital blocks like the "CAF Check Failed" gate, fiduciaries use a paper/fax-based audit using Form 4506-T.[1] By signing as a Fiduciary under Treasury Regulation § 601.503(d), the officer establishes a vested legal interest in the withheld funds, allowing for a manual review of the Payer's 945 credit balance.[1]
3. **Record of Account Transcript:** This document combines the tax return and tax account transcripts, providing a complete view of the module's history and identifying any TC-810 freezes.[1]
4. **Information Returns Master File (IRMF):** The IRS Call-Out Team pulls the Payer's 945 Transcript to confirm if deposits match the 1099-OID reported in the IRMF.[1]

ECCLESIA LAW

# Forensic Analysis of Agentic Securitization: The Argent System

# US Bank FBO Structure and the Wyoming Series LLC Model

The management of large-scale recoupment operations requires a centralized fiduciary hub. MLITR Research LLC (operating as Ecclesia Trustees) has engaged the US Bank Institutional Client Group to establish such a hub using a For-Benefit-Of (FBO) account structure.[1] This bank-owned solution allows a "Program Manager" to move money on behalf of customers directly within their own technology platform.[1]

The US Bank FBO solution utilizes a virtual account structure to segregate and reconcile customer account activity.[1] Individual grantor trusts are established as segregated ledgers within the master FBO structure, each assigned its own unique account number for direct ACH or Fedwire routing.[1] This system supports same-day ACH, domestic wires, and instant payments through the RTP network or FedNow Service.[1]

## Functional Components of the FBO Fiduciary Hub

| Feature | Technical Description | Operational Impact |
|---|---|---|
| Virtual Accounts | Segregated ledgers within a master FBO.[1] | Enables tracking of individual customer balances. |
| API Onboarding | Real-time customer verification and setup.[1] | Supports growth of 100+ new trusts per month. |
| Real-Time Reporting | Balance reporting (Posted, Value date, Current).[1] | Facilitates automated reconciliation. |
| Compliance API | KYC systems linked to bank onboarding.[1] | Removes the need for physical branch visits. |

The organizational model for this hub is the Wyoming Series LLC, governed by Wyoming Statute § 17-29-211.[1] Under this model, a master LLC can establish internal sub-entities (series) with complete liability firewalls.[1] The debts and obligations of one series are enforceable only against that series' assets and do not impact the master LLC or other sub-series.[1] This model provides high levels of privacy and liability

segregation while operating under attorney-in-fact mandates rather than traditional trust company regulations.[1]

## Treasury Reserve Draining and Solvency Reconciliation

From a systemic perspective, the recoupment of abandoned signature credit is integrated into the broader architecture of the Treasury General Account (TGA) at the Federal Reserve.[1] Tax receipts from Form 945 and Form 1120 serve to buffer fluctuations in receipts and disbursements and are categorized as reserve-draining devices used to maintain price and interest-rate stability.[1]

Because the Federal Reserve and the commercial banking system create credit ex nihilo, the recoupment operations do not present a solvency problem for the general fund.[1] Instead, they represent a correction of the administrative record. Recoupment operations correctly identify and re-allocate credit originated by the living soul but held as abandoned property by nominees.[1] For the top systemic nominees, the combined corporate income tax (CIT) modules hold billions in overpayment credits, providing more than sufficient capacity for authorized cross-modular transfers to satisfy 98-series grantor trust filings.[1]

The integration of the Clifford Protocol into this ecosystem provides a structural remedy for the "Debtor Trap" associated with SSN-based filings.[1] The IRS algorithm is hard-coded to recognize SSN filings as operations of the corporate debtor estate created by the birth certificate, often triggering fraud filters (Code 810).[1] By utilizing the 98-series trust and the jurisdictional correction of the Envoy Protocol, the living soul reoccupies the office of General Executor, taking control of all assets and liabilities through a lawful fiduciary proxy.[1]

## Technical Synthesis of the Clifford Protocol and Recovery

The administrative sequence for successful recoupment follows a precise five-step protocol:

1. **Recognition:** Identification of the original signature as an OID instrument representing credit energy.[1]
2. **Issue Price Establishment:** Determination that the issue price was zero ($0) because the credit was created at the moment of signing.[1]
3. **OID Identification:** Calculation of the hidden OID as the difference between the zero-issue price and the face value of the negotiable instrument.[1]
4. **Nominee Identification:** Defining the financial institution as a middleman that captured this credit and reported it under their own omnibus 945 module.[1]
5. **Redirection:** Filing a corrective 1099-OID to redirect the withheld tax to the 98-series International Grantor Trust as the lawful recipient.[1]

This protocol ensures that every transfer is forensically validated. The use of professional ERO compliance and IRS-approved electronic filing software guarantees that all filings are processed through the standard federal income tax system.[1] Once the IRS determines an overpayment exists via its standard matching systems, the U.S. Treasury authorizes payment, disbursed via the federal payment network as "IRS TREAS 310".[1] These funds are credited to the 98-series trust's FBO account, subject to ordinary BSA/AML and transaction monitoring controls.[1]

The implementation of the Argent system's "Vibe Coding" paradigm and Spec-Driven Development (SDD) further enhances the reliability of this process.[1] By defining the specification architecture and task breakdown within an authoritative contract for the AI network, fiduciaries maintain a "Straight Line Delivery" model, where strategic intent moves directly to member delivery without the friction of manual oversight.[1] This represents a fundamental shift in technical operations, replacing manual "heroic saves" with a systematic, data-driven flow that restores jurisdictional autonomy to the original creators of credit energy.

ECCLESIA LAW

**Works cited**


1. THE CLIFFORD PROTOCOL.pdf
2. Publication 1212 (12/2025), Guide to Original Issue Discount (OID) Instruments - IRS, accessed on April 5, 2026, https://www.irs.gov/publications/p1212
3. Bills of Exchange Act ( RSC , 1985, c. B-4) - Justice Laws Website, accessed on April 5, 2026, https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/b-4/fulltext.html
4. § 3-203. TRANSFER OF INSTRUMENT; RIGHTS ACQUIRED BY TRANSFER. | Uniform Commercial Code | US Law | LII / Legal Information Institute - Law.Cornell.Edu, accessed on April 5, 2026, https://www.law.cornell.edu/ucc/3/3-203
5. Bills of Exchange Act 1882 - Legislation.gov.uk, accessed on April 5, 2026, https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Vict/45-46/61/contents/data.html
6. Uniform Commercial Code - Uniform Law Commission, accessed on April 5, 2026, https://www.uniformlaws.org/acts/ucc
7. 14-7503 - Transfer of negotiable instrument by fiduciary, accessed on April 5, 2026, https://www.azleg.gov/ars/14/07503.htm
8. Section 25 in Bills of Exchange Act 1882 | Draft Bot Pro, accessed on April 5, 2026, https://app.draftbotpro.com/doc/4866835
9. Publication 1212 (Rev. December 2025) - IRS, accessed on April 5, 2026, https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/p1212.pdf
10. Instructions for Schedule B (Form 1040) (2025) | Internal Revenue Service, accessed on April 5, 2026, https://www.irs.gov/instructions/i1040sb
11. Publication 1212 (Rev. January 2022) - IRS, accessed on April 5, 2026, https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-dft/p1212--dft.pdf
12. Rev Proc 2002-26 - Bradford Tax Institute, accessed on April 5, 2026, https://bradfordtaxinstitute.com/Endnotes/Rev_Proc_2002-26.pdf
13. Don't Always Believe What the IRS Tells You About Your Trust Fund Taxes (or Anything Else), accessed on April 5, 2026, https://www.taxproblemattorneyblog.com/dont-always-believe-what-the-irs-tells-you-about-your-trust-fund-taxes-or-anything-else/

14. IRS bound to honor designation of voluntary payment by one taxpayer of another's liability, accessed on April 5, 2026, https://www.journalofaccountancy.com/issues/2013/dec/withholding-liability/

15. accessed on April 5, 2026, https://www.levytaxhelp.com/what-does-810-refund-freeze-mean/#:~:text=IRS%20Code%20810%20Explanation&text=Usually%2C%20this%20is%20because%20the,the%20notification%20of%20this%20freeze.

16. Topic no. 159, How to get a wage and income transcript or copy of Form W-2 - IRS, accessed on April 5, 2026, https://www.irs.gov/taxtopics/tc159

17. Transcript types for individuals and ways to order them | Internal Revenue Service, accessed on April 5, 2026, https://www.irs.gov/individuals/transcript-types-for-individuals-and-ways-to-order-them